

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:**

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application, of which this Amendment adds claims 12-28. In the Office Action dated July 28, 2006, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 and 8-11 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Elg (WO 99/37106), and has rejected claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Elg in view of Davies (WO 02/01811).

Claims 1 and 10 are amended to avoid the term “characterised by”. Claims 1, 8, and 10-11 are amended to change spelling of “synchronization” to “synchronizaton”. Such amendments are not for reasons related to patentability but to comport with more common American grammar and spelling, so all potential equivalents are seen to be preserved. Claim 11 is further amended to add “second” at line 6 prior to the term “synchronizaton word” to unequivocally distinguish from the recited “first synchronizaton word” at lines 3-4.

**Interview Summary:**

At the request of the undersigned, a telephone interview was held on October 10, 2006 between the undersigned representative, Examiner Nguyen, and supervising Examiner Quoc Hien Vuong. The undersigned reviewed the Office Action remarks concerning the claim 1 messages of the “first type” (Elg, page 6 lines 15-21) and “second type” (Elg, page 9 lines 14-30). It was noted that page 9 line 22 of Elg discloses a “connection setup” message, so it was not seen how a series of Elg connection setup messages (Elg page 9) could be punctuated with the Elg beacon messages (Elg page 6) that wake slave devices from a PARK mode. It was agreed by all three parties that Elg does not anticipate claim 1, because Elg does not disclose punctuating messages of first and second types as recited in claim 1.

**Remarks:**

Claims 1, 10 and 11 are independent. Claim 10 recites in relevant part:

punctuating a series of messages of a first type transmitted by the master transceiver outside the network of transceivers, with messages of a second type transmitted within the network of communicating transceivers for maintaining synchronizaton.

Claim 11 recites in relevant part:

means for punctuating transmission of a series of messages of a first type comprising a first synchronizaton word independent of the identity of the low power radio frequency transceiver, with messages of a


second type comprising a second synchronization word dependent upon the identity of the low power radio frequency transceiver.

For the reasons discussed and agreed in the interview summarized above, Elg is not seen to anticipate either of claims 10 or 11 for the same distinction of claim 1 over Elg: punctuating messages of different types. Added independent claim 19 also recites punctuating messages of different types, and is therefore seen to be novel over Elg.

Davies also does not disclose punctuating messages of different types, and is not cited for such a teaching. Therefore, claims 1-28 are seen as novel and non-obvious over Elg, Davies, or their combination.

The undersigned thanks the Examiner and his supervisor for the teleconference noted above, and respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and claims 1-28 be passed to issue. The undersigned welcomes the opportunity to resolve any other matters that may arise, formal or otherwise, via teleconference at the Examiner's discretion.

Respectfully submitted:

  
Gerald J. Stanton  
Reg. No.: 46,008

October 30, 2006  
Date

Customer No.: 29683  
HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212  
Phone: (203) 925-9400  
Facsimile: (203) 944-0245  
Email: gstanton@hspatent.com

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

October 30, 2006  
Date

  
Name of Person Making Deposit